DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 499 FL 007 394

AUTHOR Christian, Donna
TITLE Non-Participle "Done" and Non-Productive Classification.
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at Colloquium on New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English (4th, Washington, D.C., October 24-25, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *American English; Descriptive Linguistics; Dialect Studies; Form Classes (Languages); Language Classification; Language Research; Language Usage; *Language Variation; *Regional Dialects; *Semantics; Southern States; Syntax; *Verbs
IDENTIFIERS *Appalachian English

ABSTRACT

"Done" occurs outside of the participle paradigm in several varieties of English particularly those associated currently or historically with the South. This feature is also found in Appalachian English. Grammatical classifications have been proposed, including that of quasi-modal, pre-verbal form, and adverb. None of the labelling attempts successfully explains the non-participle "done" paradigm. Clearer understanding of non-participle "done" emerges in the light of its semantic and pragmatic characteristics. Scott treats the non-participle "done" in Black English as "a focus-marker, to emphasize the completion" of the accompanying verb phrase, and points out its semantic incompatibility with certain verb forms. An expansion of this approach can be supported for the "done" in Appalachian English. Data are presented to argue that: (1) the semantics of "done," as a marker of completion or perfective aspect, explains its co-occurrence restrictions with other verb forms; and (2) the functional aspects of its use determine its general incompatibility with clause types other than assertions where it is used to add emphasis. It is argued that syntactic classification alone is not sufficient. The proposal made here is that "done" has the semantic content that indicates the perfective aspect, or completion, and that its pragmatic function is to add emphasis or to intensify an assertion. (Author/CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116499

Non-participle done and Non-productive Classification

Donna Christian
Georgetown University and the
Center for Applied Linguistics

Presented at: Fourth Annual Colloquium on New Ways of Analyzing
Variation in English
Georgetown University
October 1975

FL007394

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Non-participle *done* and Non-productive Classification

The use of *done* outside of the participle paradigm has been noticed in treatments of several varieties of English, particularly those associated currently or historically with the South. This feature also occurs in Appalachian English[1] (henceforth AE), and although there may be some differences between varieties in the details of its operation, the form generally seems to be a part of many non-mainstream-varieties of English. As with most cases of syntactic variation, the usual problems arise, particularly in terms of relatively infrequent occurrence of the construction. However, the sample under consideration yielded what appears to be a sufficient number of examples to allow an investigation of the usage, supplemented by informal observations and judgments of acceptability by native speakers from the area. From these sources, we can examine the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic characteristics of non-participle *done*. A syntactic account alone appears to point to a non-productive type of classification, that is, one which applies to only one item, while a clearer understanding of *done* emerges from the semantic and pragmatic aspects of its usage. We will deal first with some broad characteristics of this form, then go on to look at the semantic and pragmatic factors that seem to be involved in its usage. Finally, we will return to the syntactic aspects and discuss the problem of classification in particular.

The feature in question is the use of *done* in constructions like those given in (1):[2]

(1) a. I *done* forgot when it opened. 159:22

b. And the doctor *done* give him up, said he's got pneumonia. 22:12

c. ...because the one that was in there had *done* rotted. 35:21

d. We thought he was done gone. 51:11

e. If she had, she woulda done left me a long time ago. 30:29

The pattern which the usage of done typically follows can be seen in the examples cited in (1). It can occur alone with a past form of the verb, as in (1a, b) or it can intervene in a complex verb phrase which consists of an auxiliary and a main verb, including a modal, as in (1c-e).

Some investigators have specified a more restricted context for the distribution of this marker, for example, that it is only followed by the past participial form of a verb. However, in these data from AE, the existence of pairs like the utterances in (2) would seem to make such a restriction unsuitable, since both the preterit and past participial forms of take are found in construction with done.

(2) a. ... and then she done taken two courses again. 83:7

b. ... she done took the baby away from her. 159:38

For such a restriction to be substantiated, cases (where the auxiliary was not overtly realized) that would constitute evidence involve the irregular verbs of English, since, for the regular verbs, the two past forms are identical. However, there is wide variation in the past forms of irregular verbs in AE (Wolfram and Christian 1975) which complicates the matter. The preterit and past participial forms of irregular verbs often change functions in AE, so that the precise identification of the grammatical function of the verb form being used with done becomes even more difficult. For instance, for the verb take found in (2), the forms took and taken were each observed to be used both as a preterit and as a past participle.

Another form such evidence could take would be to demonstrate that done occurs only in complex verb phrases but the auxiliary may be deleted. If this

were supported, then the form of the verb could be assumed to have a participial function. Such an interpretation would claim that (3a) is derived from (3b) through the phonological process of *have* deletion.

(3) a. I *done* forgot some of them stories. 49:19

b. I have *done* forgot some of them stories.

While it might be expected that some cases of *done* do occur within verb phrases that have undergone *have* deletion, it cannot be claimed that all instances of *done* occur in such contexts. There are several cases that support this argument. First, we observe that *done* also occurs with an auxiliary other than *have*, as in (4):

(4) So they got down there and called back and Connie was *done* gone. 77:13

Given sentences like (4), any explanation of *done* cannot rest solely on its co-occurrence with *have* and so little would be gained by positing *have*-deletion. Secondly, there are some examples in the data in which a grammatically perfective construction could not be substituted, due to the surrounding context, as in:

(5) They let her up the second day and when she come home the next day she *done* had the fever. That's what you call the childbed fever. 22:17

In (5), it is clear that when the woman in question arrived at home she still had the fever. (This is further confirmed by the fact that the informant goes on to tell about going back to the hospital for medicine). This would not be a possible reading if the clause was *she had (done) had the fever* since the perfective auxiliary would indicate that having the fever temporally preceded the activity in the *when* - clause. It seems then that the number of contexts in which *done* is permitted is not reducible to one, with phonological rules giving different surface constructions. The appropriate generalization appears

to be simply that done is normally associated with a past form of the main verb which may have a preterit or a past participial function. The presence or absence of the auxiliary (have or be) would serve as a cue to discriminate between the functions.

Given the above evidence, we can eliminate the possibility of a syntactic account which involves positing an underlying have that may be deleted at the phonological level. The problem that remains then is to determine what grammatical classification done falls into and how we might explain its syntactic behavior. At this point, though, we will turn to the semantics and pragmatics of its usage, since observations that can be made in those areas will be relevant to the discussion of the syntax.

Most previous studies of done have dealt mainly with describing what it means, either in terms of synonymy with some other lexical item or its effect with respect to the rest of the verb phrase. Labov (1972:55) proposes that a disjunctive meaning is required to account for this form. One component is the "perfective" sense, that in which it most "normally" occurs and is the equivalent of have (1972:55). This is the use in which it corresponds most closely to already. The second use of done is its intensive meaning, where it corresponds to really (1972:55). In most cases, Labov maintains, these two meanings converge, but occasionally one sense occurs without the other. Some investigators of White non-mainstream varieties of English who mention done follow Labov in their descriptions, but limit the meaning to the first sense. Hackenberg (1972:150), for example, speaks of done in Appalachian English as perfective, with the sense of already. However, his corpus contains only seven examples of the form.

One further treatment of done is relevant to the following discussion. Scott (1973) approaches the problem of verb forms in Vernacular Black English varieties from a strictly semantic viewpoint and looks for correlations with meaning. "Pre-verbal done", in the system she sets forth, functions to indicate completion as a "focus marker" (1973:143), interacting with other factors in the system such as temporal aspects. In conjunction with these other factors, certain co-occurrence restrictions are then explained in terms of semantic incompatibility, in that done cannot be combined with forms that carry a feature of incompletion for semantic reasons. For example, this incompatibility would be proposed to account for done's non-occurrence with the habitual verb forms, as in They (*done) wash dishes every day.

The general conception about done is that it relates to perfectivity in some way and is the equivalent (or nearly) of auxiliary have in standard English. Of course, in the AE data, there are a number of examples where the perfective have is itself realized, but it could be assumed that done then simply redundantly expresses the perfective force of the have, much in the same way that the complementizer -en that is associated with it does. Consider the following sentences:

(6) a. I was scared to death after I done stepped on it. 164:15

b. Well, we went down there to see him in June and the doctor done give him up, said he's got pneumonia... 22:12

In these, and others like these, the substitution of have for done seems to give a fairly close approximation of the meaning of the sentence, and it was undoubtedly such sentences that led other investigators to the above conclusion. However, in our data, there are environments where have and done are clearly not equivalent, as seen above in (5) in the discussion of have-deletion:

(7) ... when she come home the next day, she done had the fever. 22:17

and others, also seen previously, where done follows an auxiliary other than have. When a range of environments such as those in our sample are considered, then, an equivalence with have does not provide an accurate account of done's meaning.

A similar situation exists with those investigators who claim that done corresponds to already. Again there are some contexts where the pair of sentences would be very much alike in meaning, as in:

(8) a. If I'd do the laundry, she'd do the laundry, you know, go back and do the same thing over again that I done ironed and put away. 36:15

b. I reckon she's done sold it. 153:32

However, there are also a large number of examples where this is not the case:

(9) a. Oh, he likeța had a fit. He said, "My god, you done killed that man's horse!" 146:8

b. We thought well we can sit back and enjoy our labor of the years gone by since the children had done left home. 37:16

c. Where was I? You done made me forget! 151:6

Here the semantic facts bear a relationship to the reasons why this might have appeared to be a reasonable hypothesis. Already indicates something like previously, in the sense, very roughly speaking, of prior to the present or some other specified time. This is illustrated in the sentences of (10)

(10) a. I reckon she's already sold it. (prior to now)

b. When you arrive, the food will already be there. (prior to future time).

When already refers to some past time, as in (10a) it is possible for it to look similar to done (cf. (8b)), but this does not happen when already refers to a non-past time, as in (10b). In addition, as we saw in (9), there are

numerous cases of done with past forms of a verb where already cannot be considered even roughly equivalent. It seems then, that the apparent similarity of done to already is due to the latter's reference to past time when it interacts with a past form of a verb rather than any real correspondence between their inherent meanings.

What is suggested here follows the proposal of Scott (1973) in maintaining that the distinctiveness of done lies in its completive aspect, while other investigators seem to have focused on its pastness. The motivation for this conclusion comes mainly from evidence of the type Scott calls semantic incompatibility in her discussion of done's non-occurrence with certain types of verb phrases, specifically what she calls the continuative forms and the habitual non-continuative (Scott 1973:143). Thus, we can provide semantic correlates to the distribution facts previously noted, in that done cannot be paired with a tense or aspect that would not allow a completive interpretation for the verb phrase. This is shown in the unacceptability of sentences with future, present, or progressive forms of verbs, as in (11):

(11) a. I'll (*done) finish this letter later.

b. I'll go to the store when I (*done) finish this letter.

c. I didn't know it then but I was (*done) stepping on a snake.

In the last example, the progressive form prevents a completive aspect, even though a past time is indicated. This factor can be isolated as the determining one since otherwise semantically, the sentence is acceptable as seen when the progressive is replaced:

(12) I didn't know it then, but I (had) done stepped on a snake.

Another bit of evidence for the completive meaning comes from co-occurrence restriction with certain adverbials. Adverbs like always, usually, often,

generally, normally, etc., modify the verb phrase in part with an incompletive or continuative sense, making them incompatible with done, as we see in (13):[3]

(13) a. He always (*done) ate everything in sight.

b. She has always (*done) eaten everything in sight.

c. They often (*done) forgot their lunch.

d. They had generally (*done) paid their bills on time.

A set of adverbs which would also appear to be excluded in these structures are those which overtly signify incompletion, of the type of almost, nearly, just about, etc. Although none of these occur in the present data, it may be possible to use them to qualify the completeness aspect of done, given that sentences like (14) are probably at least marginally acceptable.

(14) He (?done) almost fell down two flights of stairs.

Feagin (in preparation) has an example of this in White Alabama English in:

(15) I done 'bout forgot.

and comments that this may be a way to hedge on or qualify done. With only this one example, though, it is impossible to draw any conclusions on how extensive the possibilities of qualifying the completive meaning might be.

Finally, verbs which are non-completive in nature also are generally unacceptable in a construction with done. This is illustrated in (16):

(16) a. She (*done) was happy to hear the news.

b. They had (*done) seemed upset.

c. I (*done) wanted to finish that book last night.

d. They (*done) happened to be at the theater when we arrived.

This appears to be the same sort of relationship as that between stative verbs and other grammatical constructions as pointed out by Lakoff (1970). However, as in those co-occurrence limitations, there also appear to be exceptions.

(17) ... and when she come home the next day, she done had the fever. 22:17

Here, the main verb have would seem to work against getting a completive reading with done, but what happens instead is that done in some way forces a completiveness onto have. In (17) the focus appears to be on getting the sickness, or the beginning of the process of having it, which was over, rather than on having it, which was ongoing, at the time being referred to. Thus, a possible generalization is that done cannot occur with verbs that are in some way anti-completive, but may be used with verbs that have a potential completive component which is then reinforced.

A further consideration in describing any language phenomena involves viewing it from a functional perspective. That is, why would a speaker choose to encode it in a particular utterance (over and above syntactic and semantic aspects which may limit the choice) and what work does it accomplish there? In order to look at this aspect, such factors as the role of speaker intentions and assumptions are given attention. While this notion is clearly an important one, its exploration in linguistic studies is still in the early stages. This section will deal briefly with one facet of how done seems to be functioning pragmatically in AE, with a suggestion for how this may tie in with the syntactic and semantic characteristics of its usage.

An observation that can be made about the examples in our data is that often, if not always, done appears to carry some emphasis with it. That is most obvious in narratives, where such devices are frequent, as in (18):

(18) a. She opened the oven door to put her bread in to bake it and there set the cat. Hide done busted off his skill and fell down and his meat just come off'n his bones. 31:25

b. That's when they had the big flood. He just runned it down. You shoulda seen him coming out of there. We thought he was done gone. Just straight down, too. 51:11

The emphatic effect is also present in some non-narrative contexts, as in (19):

(19) a. When I was a boy, if you seen a woman's knee, you had done seen something and now you can just see anything they've got. 31:15.

b. ... and then the next thing you know she's done throwed herself plumb to the dogs. Well, once when she puts herself to the dogs it's harder for a woman to pull herself back than it is a man. 30:29

The problem with dealing with a notion like emphasis is that there is so little that is known about it, in terms of how it is accomplished (i.e. its correlation with stress, intonation, certain grammatical processes) and how it functions. Hooper and Thompson (1973) maintain that emphasis can be given only to an asserted clause. They further show that certain transformations (taken from Emonds, 1971) which serve to make a sentence more emphatic apply not only to main clauses but also to certain embedded clauses. Prior to this, it had to be assumed that only main clauses could be asserted, with questions, negations and all embedded clauses excluded. Hooper and Thompson argue that with certain verbs, which they call "assertive predicates", the clauses embedded under them are asserted, using the application of the emphasis-giving transformations within them as evidence. They also maintain that non-restrictive relative clauses and certain relative and adverbial clauses are asserted rather than presupposed. Green (1974), however, argues that all of the emphatic constructions in question above do not have the same distribution, that is, within

assertions as defined by Hooper and Thomspon. Their distribution is, instead, "determined pragmatically, not structurally or even semantically in the logician's sense" (Green 1974:190). Evidence is given that their applicability depends on the speaker's intentions and assumptions, in particular with respect to certainty about or agreement with the proposition involved. In other words, it is unlikely that speakers would use a device to make a proposition more emphatic if they are uncertain about its validity.

Since the kind of evidence used by both Hooper and Thompson (1973) and Green (1974), the distribution of transformations with emphatic function, is not applicable to the present discussion, their conclusions with respect to emphasis will simply be examined as they might apply to done. A substantial number of the propositions containing done are clearcut assertions (non-interrogative, non-negative, non-embedded clauses). Of the 65 examples from our sample, 48 fall into this category. An additional 7 instances of done are found in embedded clauses of the type Hooper and Thompson (1973) would call "assertive", with higher predicates like say, think, reckon, as in:

(20) Fieldworker: I was thinking about buying that old car of hers.

Informant: I reckon she's done sold it. 153:32.

Green's (1974) refinement of the Hooper and Thompson treatment of assertion seems to be the right direction to take on this issue, so it should be noted that the 7 examples referred to above would also fit her criterion with respect to the speaker's assumptions of certainty or validity. For example, in (20), the informant's main proposition appears to be the assertion that the car has been sold, the certainty of which is hedged on slightly with I reckon, but the proposition is assumed to be fairly certain.

The remaining 10 occurrences of done are found in subordinate clauses

of other types, which would not be considered as asserting their proposition within the framework proposed by Hooper and Thompson. Green (1974), on the other hand, points out that attempting to fit every emphatic clause into the category of assertion might well destroy the integrity of that category. It seems that, although this last group of done clauses are perhaps non-assertive, they are at least candidates for emphasis. The majority of these are adverbial clauses of time and reason and are, of course, referring to past time because of the other factors involved in the use of done. Green's proposal seems applicable here in suggesting how done may be used emphatically in these cases. The use of such an adverbial points to something which simply precedes (time) or precedes and is causally related to (reason) the main proposition of the utterance. If the main proposition is an assertion, which it is in each case, the speaker's level of certainty with respect to the adverbial would seem to be quite high and since done contributes to the past completion aspect, this might explain how done can be used emphatically in such non-assertions. Examples from this category are:

(21) a. (time) They happened to see it, you know, after I done run. And it went into the water, I imagine it's a water snake. 164:16

b. (time) And I said Bobby, now if you ll just throw another one right in on top of that one, after you done vomited, I says, it never will make you sick anymore. So he throwed him another chew and by God he liketa died on that thing. 146:24

c. (reason) We had to tear out the floor winter before last in the kitchen and put in a whole new floor because the one that was in there had done rotted. 35:21

An original motivation for looking at done with respect to emphasis came from the fact that our data contain no instances in which it occurs in questions or negative utterances. This is a further argument for the emphatic use of done. Feagin (in preparation), however, reports that her data do in fact show questions (both with and without subject-auxiliary inversion), tag questions (2 instances), and negatives (only one instance). This may indicate that this pragmatic aspect of done is optional; that is, the speaker may choose to use done emphatically or not, depending on what assumptions are held about the proposition being expressed.

What has been suggested so far, then, is the following: The semantic properties of done indicate that it has a completive meaning and this would account for certain of its co-occurrence restrictions. In addition, it appears that done is generally, if not always, used with an emphatic or intensifying function which determines its higher compatibility with assertions than with other clause types. Now we can go back to the syntactic characteristics and see if there is a classification and syntactic account that fits these properties.

As Labov observes (1972:56), done has "lost its status as a verb" in the usage described above. It is uninflected for any tense marking or agreement, occurring before a verb which is inflected (with or without a preceding inflected auxiliary). Grammatical classifications that have been proposed include that of quasi-modal (Labov et al 1968), "pre-verbal" form (Dillard 1972) and adverb (Labov 1972). Since simply labelling done as a "pre-verbal" form makes no real formal claims that can be tested, we will examine only the modal and adverb classifications. Because of done's position in the verb phrase and its morphological properties, these two classifications would appear to be likely candidates.

Considering first the modal possibility, it would be instructive to examine

instances of questions and negative sentences. However, there are no examples in our data of done occurring in such structures and it may be that these are not allowable combinations for AE speakers. If they are, it seems unlikely that done would behave like a modal in those situations, i.e., in inverting for questions and having the negative particle follow it. We would not expect, for example, to find cases like those in (22) where done is shown in the position a modal would take:

(22) a. *Done they finished their work?

b. *They done not finished their work.

In Feagin's data from Alabama, as we mentioned earlier, there are a few instances of questions and negatives with done. In all of the examples cited which involve inversion for questions or contain a negative, the have auxiliary is present as well, as in (23a,b) and for questions that do not contain have, no inversion takes place, as in (23c):

23) a. Has he done come back?

b. I carry it if somebody hadn't done got it.

c. What's the matter? You done tuck up some cold?

(from Feagin in preparation)

The example in (23c) might be an instance of auxiliary deletion which often occurs with questions in informal English. In any case, done does not behave like a modal with respect to subject-auxiliary inversion or negation, if it can occur in such constructions at all.

Done does not govern a particular form of the verb following it, as a modal or auxiliary would. The fact that the overwhelming number of cases in our data involve a past form seems to stem from independent syntactic and semantic considerations rather than a relationship of government. In all our examples, the verb phrases fits the AE system syntactically when the done is

removed, whether a single verb form in the past remains or certain modals or auxiliaries are present in addition to the verb. (This is again taking into account the variations found in the irregular verbs we mentioned before.) In addition, modals precede auxiliaries in surface verb phrases of English, and done follows the auxiliary when one is present. As this type of evidence builds up, it would appear to be a hard task to justify formally the classification of done as a modal.

On the other hand, there is no real convincing evidence that would point to the appropriateness of considering done to be an adverb, except for some vague notion of modification of the verb phrase in which it occurs. Syntactically, it does not display the distributional privileges that various types of adverbials show. For example, adverbs can typically be moved away from the verb phrase to another part of the sentence, as in (24):[4]

(24) a. They quickly put out the fire.

b. They put out the fire quickly.

c. Quickly, they put out the fire.

Done, however, cannot be moved to any position other than the one it occupies in the verb phrase as in the sentences in (1) above. It is never fronted or relocated outside the clause in which it originates.

Another difference in behavior between done and adverbs is found in reduced clauses. Most adverbs seem to occur relatively freely in such clauses, as in (25):

(25) a. John is believed to have quietly left town.

b. They seem to have almost gotten away.

c. Judy's having already left surprised me.

There are no such occurrences of done in our data, nor are any cited by either Feagin (in preparation) or Hackenberg (1972).

It therefore seems likely that sentences like those in (26) would be unacceptable:

(26) a. ?(*) John is believed to have done left town.

b. ?(*) They seem to have done got(ten) away.

c. ?(*) Judy's having done left surprised me.

We see in (26) that done, unlike adverbs, is probably restricted to unreduced clauses, since for sentences like those, it is not semantically ruled out, as shown in (27):

(27) a. I believe that John (has) done left town.

b. It seems like they ('ve) done got(ten) away.

c. It surprised me that Judy (had) done left.[5]

Although adverb is somewhat more satisfying as a label for done than modal, in the sense that it has less concrete evidence against it, neither classification is without problems. One final possibility is available, however, in that done might be handled as a special marker within the tense and aspect system of AE. The semantic characteristics would then be reflected formally as it would specifically mark the past completion of an action or event. As Wolfram and Fasold observe, done is "an additional perfective construction in some nonstandard dialects, not a substitute for present perfect tense in SE [standard English] but in addition to it." (1974:152). The fact that it is not a substitute for any tense in Standard English can be seen in the following acceptable done sentences where it interacts with each of the possible tenses (having a past involved):

(28) a. She (done) sold it at noon yesterday.

b. She has (done) sold it by now.

c. She had (done) sold it by the time I got there.

The time adverbs in each sentence are highly limited in their co-occurrence with tenses and their inclusion above shows that the addition of done does

not alter the restrictions that hold between the tenses and time adverbs (pointed out in McCawley 1971). Done will, of course, impose some additional restrictions on various co-occurrences due to its semantic characteristic of completiveness.

Using the analysis of tense proposed by McCawley (1971), we can examine how the classification of aspect marker fits this usage of done for AE speakers. In that analysis, McCawley extends Ross's analysis of auxiliaries as higher verbs to include tenses as higher verbs, with combinations of tenses providing the source for the simple past, present perfect and past perfect in English. Given the underlying structures proposed by McCawley, what is needed for AE speakers who use done might be provided through certain adjustments in this schema. McCawley allows an unlimited number of tenses to occur in the underlying structure, with only a restricted number of distinctions possible at the surface level. What may then be happening in the varieties with done is that another surface distinction of aspect is possible. This might be accounted for by allowing the surface realization of another of the tenses, marked in some way, possibly by a feature or by the node label itself, so that it does not become have but rather done. One way in which this might work follows. Naturally this is presented only very tentatively since there are still a number of unresolved issues and precise formalisms remain elusive.

As an illustration, consider (29) where done occurs with the past perfect:

(29) ...the people had done moved out of it. 7:17

Since the past perfect occurs, there must be at least two PAST's occurring in an underlying structure according to McCawley's analysis. What could be provided for done is an additional tense node that would serve as its source, with a label like PAST-COMPLETE. After a number of applications of a raising transformation to this underlying structure, the series of tenses in

the sentence would like (30):

(30) the people PAST PAST PAST-COMPLETE move out of it.

By McCawley's rules, the first tense remains, the second becomes have and then others, if present would be deleted. Here we would need to allow the realization of the third tense marker as done. Thus, varieties with done would have, in this way, a manner of expressing an additional distinction in aspect.

Under this analysis, the tense label would need to be differentiated from the others in some way, although it would undoubtedly be a simpler account if this could be eliminated. At this point, however, it seems necessary in order to avoid positing a common underlying structure for sentences with the past perfect and those with done and the simple past. Without the distinction, both would be derived from a series of two PAST's in underlying structure. For example, consider (31):

(31) a. I done killed three ground squirrels (today).

b. I had killed three ground squirrels (*today).

These sentences are non-synonymous (note the difference in acceptability with a time adverb) and therefore should differ somehow in their underlying representations. Also, the past perfect requires a reference point in the past to refer to while the simple past does not; its reference point for pastness is the present. The approach assumed here is that of varying the node label, but it is possible that ultimately another device could prove to be a more motivated and suitable choice.

This analysis would also account for cases where done follows an auxiliary other than have, as in (1d) above, repeated here:

(32) We thought he was done gone. 31:11

In these instances, there is a PAST marker for the main verb which will command the marker giving done, and so the underlying structure will be well formed with respect to done in terms of its necessary co-occurrence with a past form of the following verb. Again, broader issues which are unresolved, in this case the representation of the passives and passive-like constructions, prevent any further attempt at detailing the mechanisms involved. What is relevant for this discussion is simply that, if the analysis of done that we have looked at here is accurate, the allowance of done in cases like (32) should be relatively straightforward.

One problem arises in treating done as a tense in this way. Unlike other higher verbs of this type (including tenses under McCawley's analysis), done would not govern a complementizer nor would it be affected by the complementizer associated with the immediately higher verb. For instance, perfective have, the realization of an underlying past tense, governs the placement of the past participle marker (-en) as a complementizer into the clause embedded under it. Done, on the other hand, appears to be transparent with respect to such processes. Since the verb phrase in which done occurs is unchanged by its presence, the placement of complementizers would seem to "pass over" done when it intervenes, so that the complementizer governed by the tense above it is attached to the clause embedded under it. It is not clear at this time how great the cost would be to accomplish this transparency of done, since determining this would involve the specification in detail of all the processes involved in accounting for tense in the way McCawley suggests. If done immediately commands the main verb, one possibility might be to allow the embedded clause to be combined with done and then proceed with the other processes, somehow ignoring done's presence. In this way, a higher PAST alone will give the preterit form of the main verb, or a have form resulting from a combination of tenses will determine that a past

participle ending is added to the main verb.

This formal difference in behavior between done in this treatment and other tenses might argue for the classification of done as an adverb, since, as an adverb, it could be considered a higher verb but would not interact with the tenses and their complementizers. However, there would remain other syntactic differences between done and adverbs, such as those discussed earlier. For instance, the fact that done cannot occur in reduced clauses while adverbs can would require some form of marking or other mechanism.

It should be clear by now that arriving at a grammatical classification for done is not a straightforward matter. The possibilities include either assigning it to an existing grammatical class or creating a new class for this item alone. However, as we have seen, both alternatives appear to result in a non-productive type of classification. If an attempt is made to include done in a group like adverbs, it turns out to be full of exceptions which would require special attention. Semantically more satisfying would be to consider done as a special case within the tense and aspect system. Since it would demand special treatment in terms of its operation within that system, though, done is not easily incorporated into the mechanisms of tense and aspect as we presently understand them. Creating an entirely new class with no particular relation to anything else for this one item is obviously non-productive.[6] Proper procedure would suggest that grammatical classification precede semantic and pragmatic analysis. However, given that grammatical classification cannot be assigned to done and yet an interesting semantic and pragmatic analysis can be done, proper procedure loses its credibility.

While it is esthetically displeasing to leave done this way, it is ethically appropriate, given the facts of the situation. If we are to maintain a notion

of discrete categories, done stands out as another example of a variation study challenging linguistic theory to look again at the way it structures the language data it seeks to study.

Notes

This work was supported by a National Institute of Education Grant (#NIE - G - 74 - 0026). I would like to thank Walt Wolfram and Peg Griffin for the many helpful comments they have provided.

1 The term "Appalachian English" is being used here somewhat loosely to refer to the variety of English found in two counties in southern West Virginia. The data for the variety under discussion here consists of 129 tape-recorded samples of casual conversation, from informants whose ages range from 7 to 93 years. For the most part, these informants represent the predominantly rural population of this area.

2 Example sentences which are taken from the corpus are referenced by the informant number preceding the colon and the page of the transcript, or tape recorder counter number in parentheses, following the colon.

3 It is not clear where the adverb would be placed in such sentences, i.e. before or after the aspect marker done. There are no examples in our data with this type of adverbial modification that might serve as a guide. Feagin (in preparation) mentions a few instances in which such modification takes place, two of which are in a construction with an auxiliary form, was, but none with a form of have. For both types of verb phrases, with and without an auxiliary, she has examples that seem to indicate that the adverb placement is variable, since some include it preceding done, others following (this may bear some relationship to scope). In any event, the sentences in (13) seem equally bad with the adverb in either position.

4 There are, of course, certain adverbs, like *just*, for which this is not the case. Their behavior does not appear sufficiently similar to that of *done* in other ways to allow us to suggest that *done* could be included as part of a particular subclass of adverbs.

5 These sentences are somewhat strange. However, their strangeness is probably related to the emphatic function discussed earlier as well as stylistic factors. The emphatic function of *done* would add even further to the un-adverb-like restrictions that must be provided to account for its behavior in all subordinate clauses, reduced or full.

6 Of course, it is always possible that other items could be found that behave in a similar fashion. We should note also here that calling *done* a lexical exception or an idiom or some other term to sweep problems under the rug is inappropriate.

REFERENCES

Dillard, J. L. 1972. Black English: Its History and Usage in the United States. New York: Vintage Books.

Emonds, Joseph. 1971. Root and Structure-Preserving Transformations. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Feagin, Crawford. in preparation. The Verb in White Alabama English. Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgetown University.

Green, Georgia M. 1974. "The Function of Form and the Form of Function," Chicago Linguistic Society 10:186-197.

Hackenberg, Robert G. 1972. A Sociolinguistic Study of Appalachian English. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgetown University.

Hooper, Joan B. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1973. "On the Applicability of Root Transformations." Linguistic Inquiry 4:465-497.

Labov, William. 1972. Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lakoff, George. 1970. Irregularity in Syntax. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehard, and Winston, Inc.

McCawley, James P. 1971. "Tense and Time Reference in English," in Charles J. Fillmore and D. Terrance Langendoen, eds. Studies in Linguistic Semantics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Scott, Jerrie. 1973. "The Need for Semantic Considerations in Accounting for the Variable Usage of Verb Forms in Black Dialects of English." University of Michigan Papers in Linguistics 1(2):140-146.

Wolfram, Walt and Donna Christian. 1975. Sociolinguistic Variables in Appalachian Dialects. Final Report, NIE - G - 74 - 0026.

Wolfram, Walt and Ralph W. Fasold. 1974. The Study of Social Dialects in American English. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.